## **EXHIBIT 38**

```
Page 1
 1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
            FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 3
 4
     NIKE, INC.,
 5
          Plaintiff,
 6
                                   Case No. 1:22-cv-00983
               vs.
 7
                                            VEC
     STOCKX LLC,
 8
          Defendant.
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
              VIDEO DEPOSITION OF JOHN L. HANSEN
16
                   San Francisco, California
17
                   Thursday, August 31, 2023
                            Volume 1
18
19
20
     STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY:
21
     REBECCA L. ROMANO, RPR, CSR, CCR
     California CSR No. 12546
22
     Nevada CCR No. 827
     Oregon CSR No. 20-0466
23
     Washington CCR No. 3491
24
     JOB NO. 6015329
     PAGES 1 - 286
25
```

	Page 2
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	
4	NIKE, INC.,
5	
	Plaintiff,
6	
	vs. Case No. 1:22-cv-00983
7	VEC
	STOCKX LLC,
8	
	Defendant.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	DEPOSITION OF JOHN L. HANSEN, taken on
18	behalf of the Defendant, at Debevoise & Plimpton
19	LLP, 650 California Street, 31st Floor,
20	San Francisco, California, commencing at 9:05 a.m.,
21	Thursday, August 31, 2023 before REBECCA L. ROMANO,
22	a Certified Shorthand Reporter, Certified Court
23	Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter.
24	
25	

Page 55

Q. I represent to you that this is a document taken from the Wayback Machine, which is an Internet archive that captures and records digital images of websites over time, and I further represent to you that this was captured by the Internet Archive on December 25th, 2019, and I direct your attention to the header and the footer on the first page which make reference to the Wayback Machine and certain dates and websites.

Have you ever looked at -- and I'm not asking specifically about this document.

Have you ever looked at StockX's Terms and Conditions of Use?

- A. I don't specifically recall reviewing their Terms and Conditions of Use.
- Q. So did you offer the opinion in paragraph 31 of your first amended report without ever looking at StockX's actual -- of their policies?

MR. MILLER: Objection.

THE DEPONENT: I don't believe I refer back to the StockX Terms and Conditions of Use. I looked at public statements on the website where consumers would interact with StockX for purposes of conducting commerce.

Page 56 In paragraph 31 of your (By Mr. Riehl) Q. first amended report, you offer an opinion about StockX's publicized return policy, right? Α. I do. You did not look at StockX's Terms and Conditions of Use as part of your effort to determine what StockX's publicized return policy was; is that right? MR. MILLER: Objection. THE DEPONENT: There were other statements about what their policy was and other documents and information that indicated how that policy was articulated on their website. So that's what I'm referring to and relying on. Q. (By Mr. Riehl) And what statements are those? I read one to you earlier from one of these exhibits, which was they don't accept returns, exchanges, or cancellations. And it's your understanding that that document was a publicly stated position in that document? MR. MILLER: Objection.

understanding of the public-facing information

That's consistent with my

THE DEPONENT:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 57 1 available on the StockX platform for purchases. 2 0. (By Mr. Riehl) And what other publicly 3 facing information on the website did you look at in your analysis of what StockX's publicized return 4 5 policy was? 6 Α. Nothing specific comes to mind. 7 also the testimony and documents and correspondence 8 that we've reviewed that talks about the lack of a 9 return policy, consistent with expectations for an 10 e-commerce site. 11 You're aware that e-commerce sites Ο. 12 typically do have publicly available terms and 13 conditions posted on their websites, right? 14 MR. MILLER: Objection. 15 That wouldn't be unusual. THE DEPONENT: 16 (By Mr. Riehl) And to determine a 0. 17 company's publicized return policy, one would 18 ordinarily want to determine whether or not the 19 company had such terms and conditions posted, 20 right? 21 MR. MILLER: Objection. 22 THE DEPONENT: I'm not sure I understand 23 your question. 24 Q. (By Mr. Riehl) If you want to know --

sorry, strike that.

Page 58 1 Do you, personally, buy things online? 2 Α. On occasion. 3 0. If you want to know the return policy of a company you are considering buying from, you 4 5 would look on their website to see if they have a 6 posted policy, right? 7 MR. MILLER: Objection. 8 THE DEPONENT: Generally, there's information that's available publicly, yeah, a page 9 10 for returns or exchanges that would set forth 11 It's not always available, but sometimes 12 it's available, and it may vary based on the 13 particular transaction. 14 (By Mr. Riehl) And in your personal 0. 15 life, if you were interested in knowing whether a 16 company you were thinking of buying from had a 17 return policy, you would look to see if they had 18 one posted, right? 19 Objection. MR. MILLER: 20 THE DEPONENT: If I was interested in 21 finding out a specific piece of information, I 22 would look for that information. 23 0. (By Mr. Riehl) So, in this case, when

you made statements about StockX's publicized

return policy, why didn't you go looking for

24

Page 59 1 StockX's publicized Terms and Conditions of Use? 2 MR. MILLER: Objection. 3 I didn't review the Terms THE DEPONENT: and Conditions of Use. I looked at other 4 5 information available in the record referencing and 6 discussing the return policy that was publicly 7 stated, as well as other information and testimony 8 about that. 9 Ο. (By Mr. Riehl) And why didn't you look 10 to see if they had publicly posted Terms and 11 Conditions of Use? 12 MR. MILLER: Objection. THE DEPONENT: Well, again, there were 13 14 references to the information that was publicly 15 available. And that was consistent with and 16 sufficient as a basis for my opinions. 17 (By Mr. Riehl) Wouldn't it also be 0. relevant to your opinions if they posted something 18 19 about that policy in their Terms and Conditions of 20 Use? 21 MR. MILLER: Objection. 22 THE DEPONENT: It would be another 23 potential source. I don't know that a consumer 24 would generally go back to click through 25 authorization for terms and conditions to return

Page 60 1 something, like a return policy. Generally that's 2 summarized on a website. 3 (By Mr. Riehl) And can you identify any 0. StockX Web page in which StockX -- strike that. 4 5 I'll ask you another question. 6 Please look at Deposition Exhibit 6. 7 Do you have any reason to think this 8 document does not show StockX's publicly available 9 Terms and Conditions of Use as of December 25th, 10 2019? 11 MR. MILLER: Objection. 12 THE DEPONENT: I don't have any basis to disagree with that. 13 14 (By Mr. Riehl) Please turn to section 6 0. 15 on the second page. 16 It's a little tricky to see paragraph 17 divisions because there aren't spaces in between, but do you see the text that looks like -- kind of 18 19 at the start of the second paragraph that begins: 20 "If a buyer receives an item"? 21 I do see that. 22 Q. So starting there, do you see that this 23 document says, "If a buyer receives an item that it 24 believes to be counterfeit, the buyer must notify 25 StockX in writing 3 days after receiving the item,

Page 61

and we will commence an investigation into the item. The buyer shall cooperate with us in the investigation and final disposition of the item, including providing photographs and other evidence of the item, providing the item to law enforcement, destroying the item, or delivering the item back to us, at our direction. If we elect to have the buyer destroy the item, the buyer shall provide reasonable proof of destruction to us. We will refund all fees and costs paid by the buyer for the item (including shipping and handling). In no event may a buyer resell any item (on StockX or elsewhere) that is reasonably believed to be counterfeit."

Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. And you had not read that language or language like it before today, right?

MR. MILLER: Objection.

THE DEPONENT: I recall seeing a reference to the "3 days" in a later publicized version of the website that was subsequent -- subsequently changed to, I think, ten days.

Q. (By Mr. Riehl) And the rest of the language we just read is not language that you saw